



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/647,875	12/06/2000	Sha Liu	2637-103	5769

6449 7590 08/25/2005

ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.
1425 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

SPOONER, LAMONT M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2654

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/647,875

Applicant(s)

LIU, SHA

Examiner

Lamont M. Spooner

Art Unit

2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 October 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1, 3, 4, and 7-9 are objected to because of the following informalities:
 - In claims 1, steps a-e have periods after each alphabetical step. Each claim must begin with a capital letter and end with a period. Periods may not be used elsewhere in the claims except for abbreviations. See *Fressola v. Manbeck*, 36USPQ2d 1211 (D.D.C. 1995). In line 5, "elements of various natural languages" should probably be - -elements of said various natural languages- -. In line 15, "though" should probably be - -through- -.
 - In claim 3, there are multiple periods within the claims.
 - In claim 4, lines 2 and 3, "in case there is blank", should probably be - -in case there is a blank- -.
 - In claim 7, line 3, "template for sentence" should probably be - -template for a sentence- -.
 - In claim 8, line 3, "template for sentence" should probably be - -template for a sentence- -.
 - In claim 9, there are multiple periods within the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 3, 5, 9 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

In claim 3, lines 3 and 4, "unifying the syntax concepts in natural languages having same function but for modifying different objects" could not be located in the disclosure. Applicant is advised to point out support, for example, p.12, lines 1 and 2, "The common restriction principle of syntax information includes: unifying those syntax information having the same function but different objects;" which does not support the claimed limitation.

In claim 5, line 6, "all the languages" is not taught in the disclosure. Applicant is advised to point out support for this limitation.

In claim 11, line 14, "displayed in the corresponding vocabulary information element items" is not described in the disclosure. The Examiner is unable to locate this information. The Applicant is advised to point out support for the limitation.

Art Unit: 2654

In claim 11, line 15, "displayed in the syntax information element items" is not described in the disclosure. The Examiner is unable to locate this information. The Applicant is advised to point out support for the limitation.

Claims 9, and 12-14 are rejected as their parent claims are rejected.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, lines 4 and 5, "all the necessary semantic information elements" is indefinite as the disclosure does not give bound nor define the limitation "necessary", "the necessary" lacks antecedent basis. In lines 6 and 7, "the commonly restricted candidate semantic information items" lacks antecedent basis, in line 7, "the original language symbols" lacks antecedent basis, in line 8, "blank information items for expanding by the user" is vague and indefinite as the Examiner is confused on how to expand a "blank" information item. In line 8, "the user" lacks antecedent basis, in line 9 "the commonly restricted candidate semantic information items" lacks antecedent basis, in line 10, "the translation system" lacks antecedent basis, in line 11 "the optimized results" lack antecedent basis, "the user" lacks antecedent basis, in line 13, "the translation" lacks antecedent basis, "the semantic information items" lacks antecedent basis, in lines 14 and 15, "the semantic information items" lacks antecedent basis, in line 16, "the translation" lacks antecedent basis, "the user" lacks antecedent basis, in

Art Unit: 2654

line 17, "the translation" lacks antecedent basis. Furthermore, each "semantic information element", "semantic information items", "commonly restricted candidate semantic information items", and "information items" are virtually indistinguishable. The Examiner has exhaustively tried to distinguish, in light of the disclosure "items" and "elements", for Example in Figs. 1 and 2, in Fig. 1, "information items" appear to represent fields, in Fig. 2, "information items" appear to represent text in fields", the "semantic information elements", p.11 of the disclosure, "all the necessary semantic information elements of various language systems, including items of definition of concepts, ..." does not provide any clarification, rendering the claim vague, indefinite and ambiguous. Where applicant acts as his or her own lexicographer to specifically define a term of a claim contrary to its ordinary meaning, the written description must clearly redefine the claim term and set forth the uncommon definition so as to put one reasonably skilled in the art on notice that the applicant intended to so redefine that claim term. *Process Control Corp. v. HydReclaim Corp.*, 190 F.3d 1350, 1357, 52 USPQ2d 1029, 1033 (Fed. Cir. 1999). The terms "item" and "elements" in claim 1 appear to refer to either text or fields or fields with text. These terms are indefinite because the specification does not clearly redefine these terms.

In claim 2, p.2, line 3 "said necessary semantic" lacks antecedent basis, "necessary" is indefinite for reasons explained above, in line 4, "items" is indefinite for reasons explained above.

In claim 3, line 4 "the syntax concepts" lacks antecedent basis", "unifying the syntax concepts in natural languages having same function but for modifying different

Art Unit: 2654

objects” is vague, and incoherent, as the Examiner is unable to determine the limitations intended in “same function but for modifying”, in line 4, “deleting as many as possible syntax concepts which are not indispensable” is indefinite as the degree of “possible” items for deletion has no clear bound or description the Examiner may refer to in the disclosure. In line 10, “the basic concepts” lacks antecedent basis, in line 11, “the attached near words” lacks antecedent basis, and is indefinite as to the degree of how “near” as in proximity or meaning, “the basic concepts” lacks antecedent basis, in line 12, “the corresponding basic concept” lacks antecedent basis, “the language” lacks antecedent basis, in line 14, “those natural language words” lacks antecedent basis, in lines 14 and 15 “the basic concepts” lack antecedent basis, in line 15 “providing blank information items” is indefinite for reasons listed above, “the dialogue template” lacks antecedent basis.

In claim 4, line 3, “the candidate information item” lacks antecedent basis, and is indefinite for reasons explained above regarding “items”, “the original language symbol” lacks antecedent basis, in lines 3 and 4, “the user” lacks antecedent basis, in line 4 “the natural language symbols” lacks antecedent basis, “the system” lacks antecedent basis.

In claim 5, lines 1 and 2, “the use frequency” lacks antecedent basis, in line 3 “the information items expanded” lacks antecedent basis, and is indefinite for the reasons explained above regarding “items”, “the user” lacks antecedent basis, in line 4, “the counting results” lacks antecedent basis, “the use frequency” lacks antecedent basis, in line 6, “the languages” lacks antecedent basis.

In claim 6, p.4, line 2, "the automatically optimized results" lacks antecedent basis, "in step 7" is indefinite and without bound, as the Examiner is unable to locate a step 7.

In claim 9, lines 4 and 4 "vaguely commonly restricting" is indefinite as the examiner is unable to define a degree of "vaguely", in line 7, "the grammar attributes" lacks antecedent basis, "the concepts" lacks antecedent basis.

In claim 10, line 2, "the user" lacks antecedent basis, in line 3 "the optimized results" lacks antecedent basis, "the all information dialogue template" lacks antecedent basis, in line 4, "items" is indefinite as explained above".

In claim 11, p. 4 line 2 "necessary" is indefinite as explained above. On page 5, line 7, "the selected sentence" lacks antecedent basis, in line 10, "said template" lacks antecedent basis, in line 11, "vocabulary information element items" is indefinite regarding "element" and items" as explained above, in lines 11 and 12, "syntax information element items" is indefinite regarding "element" and "items" as explained above, in line 12, "the words" lacks antecedent basis, in lines 12 and 13, "all the synonyms of the words included in the necessary semantic information library" is vague and indefinite, as well as unclear in that the Examiner is unable to distinguish whether the synonyms are in the library, or the words are in the library, "the words" lacks antecedent basis, "necessary" is indefinite as explained above, in lines 14 and 15, "information element items" is indefinite as explained above regarding "element" and "items". In line 16, "the analysis results" lacks antecedent basis, in line 17, "necessary" is indefinite as explained above, in line 18, "the user" lacks antecedent basis, "in line 19,

Art Unit: 2654

"the synonyms" lacks antecedent basis, in line 20, "the syntax information items" lacks antecedent basis, and is indefinite as explained above regarding "items", in lines 20 and 21 "the information element items" is indefinite as explained above regarding "element" and "items", in line 22, "the marking information" lacks antecedent basis, in lines 23 and 24, "the marking information" lacks antecedent basis, in line 24, "the text displayed" lacks antecedent basis, in line 25, "said marking template" lacks antecedent basis, in lines 25 and 26, "the marking information" lacks antecedent basis, in line 26, "the instructed sentence" lacks antecedent basis.

In claim 12, line 5, "necessary" is indefinite as explained above, in line 8, "syntax information items" is indefinite as explained above regarding "items".

In claim 13, line 2, "the vocabulary information items" lacks antecedent basis, and is indefinite as explained above regarding "items", "said words" lacks antecedent basis, and is indefinite as there are words in a sentence and words in a library is parent claim 11, the Examiner is unable to distinguish, in line 3, "necessary" is indefinite as explained above, in line 4, "syntax information element items" is indefinite as explained above regarding "element" and "items", "said words" lacks antecedent basis and is indefinite as explained above, in lines 4 and 5, "the syntax information items" lacks antecedent basis, and is indefinite as explained above with respect to "items". In line 6, "necessary" is indefinite as explained above.

In claim 14, "vocabulary information element items" is indefinite as explained above regarding "element" and "items", in line 3, "the vocabulary" lacks antecedent basis.

Art Unit: 2654

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected as their parent claims are rejected.

Appropriate correction is required

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lamont M. Spooner whose telephone number is 571/272-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571/272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

lms
8/18/05

Donald L. Storm
AU 2654
PATENT EXAMINER